

Remarks

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated January 7, 2007 and is due on or before April 9, 2009 with April 8, 2007 falling on a weekend.

Claims 2, 3, 8-13, 17 and 18 are pending. A new claim 18 been added to the application.

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication that Claims 12 and 13 are allowed and claims 3, 9, and 10 contain allowable subject matter.

The prior indication of allowability for Claim 8 has been withdrawn in view of USP 4,342,166 to Johnson et al (Johnson).

Claim 8 requires inter alia that "the plate [is] configured to be placed over the fastener." Additionally, the blocking member is "free from the fastener" at least when in the "first position" and when in the engaged position is "in engagement with a portion of the fastener." It is respectfully urged that these features are not shown in the Johnson patent. In regard to the rejection of claim 8 on page 4 of the office action, Johnson's bracket 22 is referred to as a "plate 22," Johnson's spring 26 (alternatively spring 11) is referred to as the resilient blocking member 26, and Johnson's pin 27 (alternatively pin 12) is referred to as fastener 27. In claim 8 the plate, as mentioned above, when in a first position is free from the fastener and is then moved or placed over the fastener. The resilient blocking member of claim 8 is movable with the plate and it too is movable to the fastener and more particularly engaged with a portion of the fastener. This relationship is not shown in Johnson and more particularly not shown in Figure 3 of Johnson (which was used to reject claim 8). Johnson's bracket 22 is welded to a rotary wheel 23 and as such it is incapable of movement with a plate, i.e. Johnson's spring 26. Plate 30 of claim 8 is placed "over the fastener" which is not the case of the embodiment illustrated in Figure 3 of Johnson; his spring 26 is not positioned over his pin 27. In claim 8 the blocking member is moved to the fastener; this too is not shown in Johnson. The amendments to Claim 8 are for the purpose of clarity and not in view of the prior art. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U. S. C. § 112. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested. Claim 11 was noted as allowed in the office action of January 27, 2006. Applicant has amended Claim 11 so that it is now the same as it was then.

Claim 11 should again be allowable as it has not been rejected by prior art in subsequent office actions. The embodiment of the invention defined in claim 17 is also not shown in Johnson; applicant has clarified the cooperation of the elements of claim 17. In view of the above it is believed claim 2 is also now allowable.

In view of the aforementioned, it is respectfully urged that the present application be reconsidered, the claims allowed, and the case passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Markell Seitzman", written in a cursive style.

Markell Seitzman
Reg. No. 28,756

(586) 726-3905
(586) 726-4172 (fax)